

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

Russia and the Hungarian Executions

The execution of former Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy and his associates was wicked, cruel and stupid. The fact that it was done in cold blood, so many months after the events that obviously produced panic among the Russians, makes it all the more horrible. The stupidity of the act can be seen in its effect on the neutralist world where it has seemed to undo so large a part of the success of Russia in impressing people with her technology and propaganda. It remains to be seen what this change in Khrushchev's methods means, how far it was forced upon him by the Stalinists in his own government or by the Chinese. It is certainly a reversion to Stalinism and it dampens the hope that a new chapter in Russian communism began with the death of Stalin.

There are many who say to those who shared this hope to some extent that these executions prove that communism will never change, that all of the alleged changes have been purely tactical or mere window dressing. Whether those who so interpret the event are correct is an open question. It is possible to say to them that even this case of reversion to Stalinism does not erase the many changes that have come in Russia in recent years. Take only one example: the rapid emptying of the forced labor camps of political prisoners. This stands as an important indication of something new and better.

Two articles in the summer issue of *Foreign Affairs* also suggest a real change of atmosphere. Hugh Gaitskell, the author of one, says: "I have yet to meet a single person who has been to Rus-

sia recently who does not comment on the changes in the atmosphere there" (p. 547). Professor Cyril E. Black of Princeton University, in another article reporting on the recent Russian election, emphasizes the fact that the party still has a monopoly of power but that it uses its power differently. He says: "One senses that a degree of relaxation among higher Party officials around the country has replaced the paralyzing fear in which they must have lived in Stalin's day" (p. 577).

John Gunther's *Inside Russia Today* leaves the impression of a remarkable movement away from the police terror of former years and of a younger generation that is so absorbed with learning and building and preparing for a better standard of living that it is not as fanatical about ideology as its predecessor. Ignorance about the outside world and a real corruption of the mind, as noted by George Kennan, still remain baffling problems but there are hopeful forces to which our minds should be open.

If there is any truth in this view, it might be desirable to stop measuring everything in Russia by American standards and to give credit where there are real movements away from political terror and where there is preoccupation with learning and building. At the same time we should strongly condemn any such reversions to Stalinism as we have recently seen in these executions. The "I told you so!" stereotype of an unchanging communism can be as blinding as wishful thinking about a changing communism.

J.C.B.

Vol. XVIII, No. 12 July 7, 1958 \$3.00 per year; 15 cents a copy

A STEP BACKWARDS

A GOOD DEAL of the news these days reports instances in which racial segregation has been overcome. One of the main areas of the battle has to do with residential segregation. Citizens of old, established communities are fearful lest the influx of minority groups lead to a depreciation of property values. Such fears are usually difficult to overcome and are the result of ingrown racial stereotypes.

Surely one of the best places to eliminate this kind of segregation is in the construction of new communities. If these communities are integrated from the start, the familiar stereotypes do not have a chance to become established; if they are segregated from the start, the pattern of segregation gains a new foothold.

It is therefore cause for real dismay that the announcement of the creation of a third "Levittown" is coupled with a restatement of a policy of segregated housing. William J. Levitt, president of Levitt and Sons, Inc., when asked whether Negroes would be able to buy houses in the new development replied: "Our policy on that is unchanged. The other two Levittowns are white communities."

The new "white community" is to have about 15,000 houses and will be located in Willingboro Township, N.J., within 25 minutes of downtown Philadelphia. Thus a community of perhaps 60,000 people will be created over the next two or three years, a community that will create, foster and perpetuate the racial divisiveness that has been a cancer in American life over the past 100 years.

The time to attack this sort of thing is before it has a chance to become an established fact. There are a number of things that different groups in and around Willingboro Township can do. No Christian minister should let this bit of racial injustice go unchallenged from his pulpit. Nor should he and his congregations let it go unchallenged when they step out of church. A good many of the prospective buyers of Levittown homes will come from the area. Could not a group of them be mobilized who would pledge not to buy in Levittown as long as it remains a segregated community and who would urge others not to buy? This is the kind of action that Levitt and Sons, Inc. would be forced to take seriously, particularly, it might be added, when the building trade is not exactly booming.

Fortunately there also is a chance that explicit

legal action can be taken immediately against Levitt and Sons, Inc. The Federal Housing Administration has already said that it will refuse to guarantee the mortgages on the new houses if a valid case of discrimination is reported. Furthermore, New Jersey has a statute which prohibits discrimination in any structure financed by public funds, or where as in the case of Levittown the mortgage is guaranteed by public funds. The State Assembly has already adopted a resolution without a dissenting vote, notifying Mr. Levitt that discrimination will not be permitted.

These facts just cited are encouraging facts, but they relate only to the legality of public funds being used to guarantee the mortgages. It will be necessary for concerned citizens in the area to continue to bring pressures wherever appropriate to see that, under *no* circumstances, whether financed publicly or privately, is a "new" community of 60,000 people allowed to develop the old pattern of segregation.

R.M.B.

PRESBYTERIANS ON FOREIGN POLICY

THE FOREIGN policy statement of the newly merged Presbyterians showed more realism about coexistence with the Communist world than it did about coexistence with our allies. In fact, the statement, though apparently a good one and in many ways encouraging, may nevertheless reflect some real problems in the effort of American Protestantism to speak about politics.

The statement saw the relation of the West to the Communist world in a long, calm historical perspective, joined with a deep awareness of the danger of nuclear war. It recalled the way that other antagonistic ideological systems in the past—Protestantism and Catholicism, Christians and Moslems—were able, finally, despite their fundamental opposition to each other, to accept the necessity of living together.

It is notable that such a document should be issued because: it used the word "coexistence" (an attempt was made to strike it out); it condemned our own moral pretension; it criticized the use of "declamatory tones"; it was favorable (much too favorable actually) to face-to-face meetings with the enemies; and, in all this and more, it unmistakably implied a strong rebuke to fellow-Presbyterian John Foster Dulles.

That such a document should be passed, with little opposition, in the representative assembly of

a major denomination is rather encouraging. That fact shows how far the nationalist-conservative strand, the one that mixes together patriotism, religion and a rough-and-ready anti-communism, has lost its place in at least the upper reaches of American Protestantism and has given way to positions more in the prophetic vein. That is good.

But this "prophetic vein" also has its faults, and these are also evident in the Presbyterian statement. Though almost too ready to live and let live with the evils of the Communist world, the statement is fierce against the evils in the non-Communist world. Though free of moralism in its realistic acceptance of the necessities of dealing with the Communists as they are, the statement is morally indignant about our allies as they are. The denunciation of the "myth of the free world" ("international hypocrisy") seemed especially out of tune when it was issued, because just at that moment the free world, mythical or not, was having a particularly bad time. The juxtaposition of crisis in Paris and rebellion in Beirut with prophetic fervor in Pittsburgh made one wonder whether we Presbyterians had struck the right balance.

The statement said: "This nation counts as its allies some nations which are in no sense free." One felt like responding, "Look fellows, we had better be thankful for what allies we can get." The statement said: "By our actions we proclaim to the world that lands where human freedom is utterly dead can qualify for membership in the free world simply by supplying military bases" Perhaps that sentence reflects the key error, a sort of a sectarian or come-outer idea of our alliance system as a pure and holy community for "membership" in which one must "qualify."

It is true, of course, that there is a moral pretension in the phrase, the "free world," that needs to be criticized. But, perhaps the more important element in the conception of the "free world system" was a bit of political pretension, an overestimation of the amount of integration that could be achieved in a vast, disparate and, despite the Presbyterians, rather "free" collection of nations. Maybe its "freedom" and the aim toward a "system" were rather contradictory, but still it has seemed and still does seem important to work for such a system.

What one misses in the Presbyterian statement is a sufficient sense of identification with the political problems and limits and responsibilities in which our nation is caught, a sense of the necessities and uses of our power and maybe even a sense of the merit of our own cause. Of course, the church should not automatically endorse whatever our side

does; but neither should it automatically "prophetically" condemn it. Expecting America somehow to reform the dictatorships with which it is linked is to make, in the extreme, the real mistake the "free world" conception may have made in much lesser degree, that of overestimating our control over others.

There must be much that is good in this Presbyterian statement. Nevertheless, reading the reports of it in the papers, one cannot help feeling, quite against one's natural inclinations, a sneaking sympathy for Mr. Dulles.

W.L.M.

THE LITTLE ROCK STORY: CHAPTER II

JUDGE HARRY J. Lemley's decisions to permit the school board in Little Rock to postpone for two and a half years its compliance with the Supreme Court decision will give great encouragement to all opponents of desegregation. If the judge had merely permitted the school board to postpone its next step in desegregation for a period of time—though two and a half years seems very long—this might have been defensible. But to allow the board to drop the seven Negro students who have been in Central High School for a year is another matter. This is shocking.

Such an action is a victory for Governor Faubus and his defiance of the law, and it proves that a small minority that believes in spitting on children can win if it keeps up the spitting long enough. It undoes the first step toward integration that was taken with such caution and cost such suffering to the Negroes of Little Rock.

The Little Rock situation does show that you cannot integrate children in a school by force alone. But if the school authorities and the moderate leaders of the community had prepared for the step that was taken last September, there would have been no such total failure. The question that persistently comes out of Little Rock is this: Why were the majority of citizens, parents and young people who believe in the rule of law and who believe in treating children decently, even if they prefer segregation, so helpless in the face of intimidation from a minority of extremists? We hate to criticize the citizens of another city from the safe distance of New York, which has its own problems, but we have heard so much good about the underlying conditions in Little Rock that we are surprised by the failure of leadership there and the failure of the rank and file of citizens to provide a shield for the Negro children against perpetual abuse from what must have been a small minority.

J.C.B.

The Perfect Law of Liberty and its Work*

A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD

Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving your own selves.

For if any be a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass:

For he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was.

But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.

James 1:22-25

THIS HAS BEEN a disillusioning year in the history of our country. While the earth has turned and this university has renewed its dedication to the learning it is now, through its graduates, about to increase, events have transpired in the world that put our whole approach to learning in doubt. The unearthly, and to us wholly unexpected, achievements of Russian science fill us with foreboding. Humiliating evidence of the low esteem in which our national aims and aspirations are held abroad pours in from all over the world. We expect what comes to us from unfriendly nations, but when personal acquaintances in friendly nations regretfully add their contribution, wormwood is mixed with the gall. The whole prospect is enough to give us pause. It is a prospect of isolation and insecurity that threatens the very foundations of our country and our civilization.

Fortunately, it is only a prospect and not a fact. We must prevent it from becoming one. But how? A problem as vast and complex as this admits of no simple solution. It reaches into every corner of our life. Some of its solution lies in the realm of world politics; some in national politics, some in science, some in military strategy; some, as we are discovering to our amazement, in the realm of music and the arts. One of the most important parts, since it touches all the others and is capable of contributing to all unity and force, is that which lies in the moral realm, the realm that has to do with our fundamental outlook on life, our basic attitudes and values. Akin to this, as wisdom is to virtue, is the part that falls within the intellectual realm, for it, too, touches upon all the other parts, quick-

ens them into life and is capable of giving them force and unity.

Our Moral and Intellectual Attitudes

It is of these two parts, our moral and intellectual attitudes, that I would speak this morning. For these are things we can do something about, without waiting for summit conferences, without depending upon foreign countries, friendly or unfriendly. These are home-grown products that we can put to any use we wish. Neglected or put to the wrong use they could lead to disaster. Properly cultivated and put to the right use they could see us safely out of our predicament.

If they are to do this, if we are to exercise the necessary degree of self-reliance and self-direction which they require, we must first see our whole problem in perspective. We are still potentially, if not actually, the most powerful nation in the world. All the Russian earth satellites, all the Yankee-go-home legends chalked on the walls of foreign cities, all the rocks thrown at our Vice President, have not disproved the fundamental soundness of our system of government and our political philosophy; there are millions, even among the slogan-chalkers and the rock-throwers, who would exchange their lot for ours if they had the chance to. No nation possesses a greater abundance of natural resources than ours, nor as productive an economy. No nation possesses a greater wealth of human talent and energy, nor provides for it so much freedom to find its natural outlet. Given the moral stamina and the intellectual purpose and drive, there is no reason why we should not be able to combine these elements to our own and the world's great benefit.

What has happened is that our ability to do this has been challenged, not our innate ability but our will, our determination. But that has been challenged many times. It was challenged in our struggle for independence. This need not dishearten us. We have survived all such challenges in the past, and we can survive this one.

In 1778, not long after the Battle of Saratoga and the Alliance with France had narrowly saved the life of our country, the French economist and statesman Turgot wrote in a prophetic vein about

* This article was originally the Baccalaureate Address delivered as a part of commencement activities at Yale University this year.

Mr. Griswold, a distinguished educator and historian, is president of Yale University.

the American people to his English friend Dr. Richard Price:

"This people is the hope of the human race. It may become the model. It ought to show the world by facts, that men can be free and yet peaceful, and may dispense with the chains in which tyrants and knaves of every color have presumed to bind them, under the pretext of the public good. The Americans should be an example of political, religious, commercial and industrial liberty. The asylum they offer to the oppressed of every nation, the avenue of escape they open, will compel governments to be just and enlightened; and the rest of the world in due time will see the empty illusions in which our policy is conceived. But to obtain these ends for us, America must secure them to herself..."

Is this not another way of saying that we must be doers of the work, not mere hearers of the word or lookers into the mirror? Granted that much of the trouble we have had in conveying to our world the impression so vividly conveyed to Turgot's and Dr. Price's has been due to the systematic opposition of Russia; granted that the Communists have done everything in their power to deface the portrait and poison the minds of its beholders; there are intrinsic flaws in the portrait that can and must be corrected. If Turgot's prophecy has not fulfilled itself as completely or convincingly as we wish it had, it is partly because we have not met his condition as fully as we might have done. If the rest of the world cannot see in us what we would like them to see it is because we cannot see it ourselves, no matter how often or how hard we stare at the mirror. The mirror cannot create; it can only reflect, and what is not there to reflect will not be reflected.

Lookers and Listeners

We have become too much a nation of lookers and listeners, a nation of spectators. Amidst the easy artificiality of our life, the plethora of substitutes for learning and thinking, the innumerable devices for avoiding or delegating personal responsibility for our opinions, even for having any opinions, the fine edge of our faith has been dulled, our creative powers atrophied.

Is our independence any less secure than it was in 1778 when Turgot wrote to Dr. Price, or for half a century afterwards when it hung by a hair in the most delicate balance between the great empires struggling for control of the world? Have we learned nothing of economic science since the teachings of the physiocrats? Has our knowledge of sci-

ence not advanced since Benjamin Franklin flew his kite? Do not the great principles of democratic self-government, tested by three and a half centuries of Anglo-American experience, have as much meaning for us in our time as they had when they were written into our Constitution? It is only our morbid imagination that writes *finis* to the creative possibilities inherent in these things.

The cure for this neurosis lies not in the stars nor in the satellites, but in ourselves. The Russians have started the cure, with shock treatment. It is we who must complete it. It goes without saying that they will not help us produce the celestial arsenal we must have to match theirs. Neither will they help us produce the wisdom to use such an arsenal in our own defense without destroying both ourselves and them in the bargain—the wisdom to avoid being maneuvered into such an impasse, to devise more civilized means of saving our civilization. All these things we must do by ourselves, out of our own intelligence and virtue, not out of listening to melodramatic countdowns from Cape Canaveral, nor expecting American virtue to flow automatically from Russian sputniks.

We have had enough of the pious cant that says the sputniks were a good thing because they will wake us up, or that the reception of the Vice President in South America was a good thing because it showed up the weaknesses in the Good Neighbor Policy. This is worse than making a virtue of necessity. It is making a virtue of disaster. The worst of the disaster has not happened yet, but it easily might if we do not look these things in the face and recognize them for what they are, namely, the result of a long cumulative process of self-deception.

We have practiced this art until we have become past masters of it. What do we think about the satellites or the Good Neighbor Policy? How do we know: we don't give ourselves time to think. Or when we have the time we spend it listening to the myriad-throated muse of the airwaves telling us what to think. The written word, with the discipline it exacts from both the writer and the reader, is succumbing to the spoken word, with its minimal demands upon the intellect, the time-worn instrument of the demagogue and the false prophet, the real opiate of the masses. The cure for this disease is in our hearts and minds, in the same combination of moral and intellectual purpose that inspired the founding of this university at a time when wisdom and virtue were closely allied and education was regarded as a means of foiling "that old deluder, Satan."

Gentlemen of the Graduating Class:

Your chances of putting things right in your country and the world are as great as any generation's that has preceded you, perhaps greater. For one thing, you sense the challenge as they did not. For another, the challenge itself is one that can be met.

Marxism is an exploded theory, disproved by the forces of history its authors counted on to prove it. It has not taken root as Marx and Engels so confidently prophesied it would in highly industrialized nations but in underdeveloped agrarian nations. In the industrialized West the progressive deterioration of labor, a basic "scientific" tenet of Marxism, has not occurred. On the contrary, labor's share of the wealth has steadily increased and its working conditions have steadily improved. Amongst Communist nations, meanwhile, far from resulting in the withering away of the state that Marx predicted with equal certitude, the application of his doctrines has produced the all-powerful state, the most highly regimented and systematic despotism in history. If Marxism had to survive

on its merits, it would perish. It survives only as an orthodoxy imposed by force.

Behind its facade are members of the same human race to which we belong, sensitive to the same things, full of hunger and fear, even as we would be in their circumstances and sometimes are in our own, husbands of wives, fathers of children, athletes, scientists, artists and musicians. What these people in the unfree lands and what their neighbors in free and friendly lands think about our civilization and our way of life will be as important a factor in preserving the security of our country and the peace of the world as the strategic defenses we must maintain against their governments. The civilization and those defenses are now entrusted to your care. You have the competence to discharge that responsibility. You have the opportunity. What you need is the courage and the purpose. You have those, too, more than you may realize, but if perchance you should wish to refresh them you need only look into the perfect law of liberty and continue therein as doers of its work and you will be blessed in your deed.

Liturgical Architecture in Protestant Churches

JAMES F. WHITE

THE CURRENT BOOM in American church building has made church architecture a much-discussed subject. Perhaps some of this discussion has come too late, but more discussion may help to clarify some of the issues involved in recent criticism of architectural trends.

For the layman, the most important consideration in church building is the theological significance of the architecture, especially in the provision made for public worship in the design and position of the liturgical centers. In the Protestant churches, these liturgical centers include the pulpit, the Lord's table, the baptismal font or baptistry, and possibly a lectern and choir stalls. The placing of these items, best analyzed by means of a floor plan, is an indication of their theological significance.

In the medieval church the plan of the entire building, including the porch, was derived from the church's liturgical functions. It is in this sense that we can speak of liturgical architecture. Even in the form of ultimate simplicity, as in the Quaker

meetinghouse, architecture may express a concept of public worship.

We Protestants are reluctant to confer any sacred quality upon the liturgical instruments of our churches (though strangely enough we regard the church itself as far more sacrosanct than did medieval people who used their church nave for dances, plays and church bazaars.) However, we must realize that liturgical centers are of great importance because they are the place where something is *done* in public worship.

A Roman Catholic writer, Theodor Filthaut, says: "The functional quality of church art is the measure of its lofty significance" (*Contemporary Church Art*, p. 51). Of no special sanctity in themselves, the pulpit, Lord's table and font have a very sacred function. They may have little to do with the subjective feeling of private worship, but they are definitely the center in which the Word is preached or re-enacted publicly.

The liturgical arrangement of a church may take an immense variety of forms. It is not by accident that most Anglicans today place baptismal fonts at the entrance to their church, whereas Baptists usually have their baptistry directly in front of

Mr. White has studied church architecture in this country and abroad and is now completing his work for a doctorate in church history at Duke University.

the congregation. Although most churches today have several liturgical centers, unified liturgical centers appear in the Anglican eighteenth century three-decker pulpit or in the combination of pulpit, table and baptismal basin in the meetinghouses of the same period.

However, judging from most of the churches being erected today, a clear concept of the theological implications of public worship seems to be almost totally absent. The amazing fact is that the majority of our new churches use a neo-medieval liturgical arrangement. This is true, not only of the Gothic revival structures still being built, but also in most of the buildings of contemporary design erected in the last few years. Somehow the same arrangement has been grafted on to Georgian revival churches, although the arrangement is completely foreign to eighteenth century ideas of worship.

The theological inconsistency of our churches is particularly glaring when we remember how important a proper architectural setting for worship was to the reformers of the sixteenth century. In medieval times, parish churches had consisted virtually of two buildings: the church and the chancel. The church (or nave) was maintained and used by the laity for their worship; the chancel, usually separated from the church by a large wooden or stone partition, was the property of the clergy and used for clerical worship. One of the triumphs of the Reformation was the opening of the chancel room to the laity, ending the division between clerical and lay worship.

In many instances, Anglicans kept the chancel screen itself, but the chancel was converted into a kind of upper room for the Lord's Supper, into which those intending to receive communion were invited to "draw near." This idea has been used experimentally recently in a few churches in the Netherlands.

The process of adapting medieval churches to meet the requirements of the Reformation worship was carried out with vigor by Anglicans and Puritans alike. Anglicans turned the medieval altar into a wooden holy table, sometimes extending the length of the chancel, and worshippers were allowed to kneel on all sides of it. No place in the building was forbidden to the laity. At times the table was actually moved into the nave where it was most convenient for all. Reformed churches frequently employed temporary tables erected in the aisles or across the front of the church, a practice which one can still see in the Netherlands today.

The problem of actually designing and erecting a large number of churches for Protestant worship was first faced in America where many differing denominations were allowed to build in freedom for the first time. Although the influence of European Protestant churches is quite apparent, America served as a vast laboratory where experimentation in liturgical architecture was possible for all groups. Perhaps the most consistent of all were the Quakers who preferred a simple building of domestic appearance, devoid of any liturgical center.

The Puritan meetinghouse evolved through several stages. A square crude type was replaced by a rectangular building with the pulpit in the middle of one long side, and this in turn was superseded by the familiar meetinghouse type with the pulpit on one of the short sides, opposite the main entrance. The constant features were a high central pulpit, sometimes fifteen feet high, and the galleries, almost a Protestant trade mark. For the Lord's Supper, celebrated monthly in some meetinghouses, a small table was placed directly beneath the pulpit.

In many Anglican churches of the eighteenth century, communion was celebrated only three times a year. A great variety of liturgical arrangements appears in the churches of this period still standing in America. At least seven distinct arrangements can be traced including pulpit and table placed at opposite ends of the building, or the pulpit located directly in front of the table. Almost invariably, the pulpit (combined sometimes with the reading desk and clerk's pew) was in a position of equal or greater prominence than the table.

The feature which united church and meetinghouse in the eighteenth century was the elimination of the clerical chancel. Occasionally a shallow apse or rectangular space appeared about the table, but in no sense was it a chancel-room. Sometimes pews were erected on either side of the table. In other words, the entire building was given over to congregational worship, and no part was reserved as a clerical prerogative. Very definitely the architecture of this period was based on the ideas of the Reformation.

The big change came in the 1840's, largely initiated by a group at Cambridge University known first as the Cambridge Camden Society and later as the Ecclesiological Society. This group, of whom John Mason Neale, the hymn translator, was the best known member, resolved to "point out defects in church-building, and infringements of religious or ecclesiastical propriety." They lost no time in pointing out such defects. In Cambridge itself a church had been recently erected concerning which

their journal, *The Ecclesiologist*, exclaimed in horror: "There is no chancel whatsoever; not even the slightest recess as an apology for one."

The Society soon reported that from 1714 to 1802, "not one satisfactory church was built" in England. They resolved to remedy this immediately. Spurning the architecture of the Renaissance as "repugnant to Catholic feeling," they turned to Gothic architecture, especially the "middle-pointed" period of the fourteenth century, as the only true Christian architecture.

The most prominent feature of the "truly Catholic edifice" which they championed was what we now call the divided chancel. The table, having become an altar again, was removed from its convenient spot before the congregation and placed at the end of a long chancel. Even the medieval chancel screen was revived as the "proper separation between the clerks and the laity." Since there were no monks now to fill the long choir stalls, a surpliced choir of pseudo-ecclesiastics was introduced to take their place. It is no wonder that opponents preached sermons such as "The Restoration of Churches is the Restoration of Popery."

The Society had amazing success in carrying out its ideals, from the reconstruction of hundreds of churches to the organization of a Ladies Ecclesiastical Embroidery Society. It spoke with a voice of apparent authority; churchmen then, as today, were very susceptible to an authoritative voice in matters of church architecture. When the Society was disbanded in 1868, *The Ecclesiologist* commented: "We have the satisfaction of retiring from the field victors."

Even the most ardent ecclesiologist could not have envisioned the full extent of their victory. It appears in most of the churches being built today by Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists and by almost every other denomination, as well as by Anglicans. Though rarely accepting the

theology of the ecclesiologists, we have appropriated their liturgical architecture. Recently in San Francisco, some Roman Catholic nuns walked into a new Presbyterian church and sat down with the congregation, not realizing it was a Protestant building.

Questions of artistic style are of transitory importance when contrasted with the theological problems of church architecture, but it may be significant that those denominations which show the greatest theological activity today have also produced the most aesthetically successful buildings. Conferences on theology and worship, along with conferences on art and worship, could be an important step toward deeper understanding of liturgical architecture.

At any rate, let us hope that some congregations will not adopt the now stereotyped neo-medieval chancel simply because they have not raised the necessary theological questions about liturgical arrangements. Even the presence of a choir in Protestant worship has yet to be theologically justified; certainly the placing of the choir as pseudo-ecclesiastics in a neo-medieval setting is open to serious questioning.

An awareness of these problems is reflected in a few new churches. Is it too much to hope that there will soon be more church buildings which witness to contemporary Protestant theology?

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion
537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK • N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
ODESSA SOUTHERN ELLIOTT, *Assistant Editor*
M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
JOSEPH SITTLER HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEE
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS
JOHN BAILLIE WILLIAM F. MAY ROGER L. SHINN
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

CONTENTS

THE PERFECT LAW OF LIBERTY AND ITS WORK
A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD
LITURGICAL ARCHITECTURE IN PROTESTANT CHURCHES
JAMES F. WHITE

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOOK RECEIVING DEPT
5201 WOODWARD AVE
DETROIT 2 MICH
27462 11-52